

to see that the whole of *CIL* VI has only one example of the verbal second person singular/medial ending *-rus*, associated with dialectal Latin and still found at Pompeii (*patiarus* at 10736: cf. Leumann–Hofmann–Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik*, 1.517; Väänänen, *Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions romaines* [Berlin, 1966], p. 87); also

tation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

broug

provided by R

inscriptions. In fact, despite a great number of low-literacy texts, the city of Rome's inscriptions emerge, on the whole, as more formal and correct than inscriptions from other areas. However, this is less peculiar if we consider that in a continuously inhabited area such as Rome coherent attempts at preservation were reserved for monumental, more carefully drafted inscriptions.

The presence of three separate indexes, in which the same material is differently arranged, is an obvious advantage, because the grammatical index is necessarily interpretative. For example extra-paradigmatic *-so* verb formations such as *facis* are in the alphabetical (e.g. under *facsis*, *facxis* etc.), but not in the grammatical index, presumably because the Editors saw them as standard from the grammatical point of view. The Editors seem to regard non-assimilated prefixes, as in *adclamantes*, as 'incorrect', but it is interesting to observe that assimilated prefixes were regarded by ancient grammarians as the colloquial, low-register variant (cf. Donatus, *Comm. Ter. ad An.* 539 ACCREVIT *ut supra* 'accurate': 'ad' *praepositione familiariter utitur*). Other omissions and discrepancies between the alphabetical and grammatical indexes are possibly unintentional. *Philematin* at 26992, which is a phonetic spelling for the slave's name *Philemation*, as in Plautus' *Mostellaria* (*-ium*), should be added to the nom. sing. forms in *-i(u)s* with omission of *ulv* (p. 292), or at least included in the Greek declension section (pp. 319–21). Also missing from the grammatical part is the third person singular perfect ending *-ut*, as in *petiut* at 36377 (for *petiuit*), *donaut* at 24481, *pugnaut* at 33983, perhaps *faciut* at 32589 (with stress on the penult). This is a case of syncope at the final syllable, as in several examples at Pompeii and elsewhere: cf. Väänänen (op.cit., p. 45).

The final index includes some new words, labelled as *hapax legomena* or *rara*. They are mostly names of professions. The only two completely absent from existing Latin lexica, because of relatively recent publication dates, are *tonsillaria* at 37822 (in my view a craftswoman skilled in making smooth, close-shorn fabrics [thus to be regarded as a wrong spelling for *tonsiliaria*?], rather than anything to do with *tonsilla*, 'mooring-stake'), and *sufforani* (*negotiatores*) at 41256 (merchants active near the forum).

Università di Pisa

ROLANDO FERRI
r.ferri@flcl.unipi.it

HELLENISTIC HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS

CANALI DE ROSSI (F.) (ed., trans.) *Iscrizioni Storiche Ellenistiche III. Decreti per ambasciatori greci al senato*. Second edition. Pp. cl + 256. Rome: Herder Editrice e Libreria, 2006 (first edition 2002). Paper, €31. ISBN: 978-88-89670-16-3.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X08001029

The first two volumes of the *Iscrizioni Storiche Ellenistiche* series, edited by L. Moretti (1967–76), offered a wide choice of different kinds of Greek inscriptions, all of great

The Classical Review vol. 58 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2008; all rights reserved

historical value, organised according to geographical distribution, and covering the years 323 to 160 B.C. This third volume also organises the documents geographically, but it collects – in general – only honorific decrees for Greek ambassadors to the Roman Senate between 200 B.C. and the end of the first century B.C. This restriction may at first glance seem odd, but one understands it better when bearing in mind that the Editor started some years ago to collect all the evidence on diplomatic relations between Rome and her allies.¹ However, for reasons which remain unexplained, some of the documents selected for this collection do not fit into the thematic, geographical or chronological framework delineated by the Editor. Those are no. 147 (votive offering to Heracles by three Epirot auxiliaries from the army of the consul Perperna); no. 154 (honorific decree for a Greek ambassador who was granted Roman citizenship under Claudius or Nero); no. 165 (the famous bronze tablet from Alcántara, bearing the *deditio in fidem* of a small Spanish community in 104 B.C.); nos 192–3 (statue bases of Greek athletes who competed in Rome); and no. 196 (three letters of king Eumenes to the city of Tyraion, restating privileges after the Peace of Apamea). In this light it is regrettable that the Editor did not choose to add some of the treaties struck between Rome and various Greek states in the second and first centuries B.C. The inclusion of those important documents would have fitted better into the framework.

The first edition of this volume quickly went out of print. For this second edition de R. has taken the opportunity to include some of the corrections and suggestions made by reviewers, notably those by P. Gauthier, *Bull. ép.* (2002), no. 7, in *REG* 115 (2002), 623–7. Some of the entries have been updated, as has the extremely useful bibliographical supplement to Moretti's *ISE* I and II (pp. xi–xxx). There are, however, no additional documents, and de R. holds firmly, but not very convincingly, to his late dating and his own interpretation of a few important inscriptions: no. 146 (Thessalian decree about the sending of corn to Rome, dated in 57 B.C. or after, rather than around 130 B.C.); no. 178 (decree for Menippus of Colophon, placed under Sulla rather than at the end of the second century B.C.); no. 189 (decree of Pergamum for an ambassador of king Attalus III, who is supposed to have played a leading role in establishing a democratic regime in the city, by decision of the king).

The most important change between the two editions appears in the appendix. In the first edition (pp. 244–8), the appendix treated a decree of Pergamum honouring Menodorus son of Metrodorus, published by M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 30 (2000), 543–76. De R. gave the text of the *editio princeps*, an Italian translation and a philological commentary with new proposals for restoration. Numerous linguistic peculiarities led him to believe that the document was a forgery; this conclusion was not followed by W. Günther, *Gnomon* 77 (2005), 181. In the second edition, this appendix has disappeared. It is replaced by a brand new appendix (pp. 244–56), in which the author puts forward a new interpretation of *ISE* I.60. This is the dedicatory inscription of the statue of the Achaean general Damon of Patrae, put up in honour of Olympic Zeus by the cities of the Achaean League to celebrate a victory over Gauls, won together with a certain Cnaeus Domitius, *stratêgos hupatos* (i.e. consul or supreme commander) of the Romans. De R. discusses and rejects, with good arguments, the two main modern interpretations of this inscription: according to L. Moretti, *Tra*

¹ *Le ambasciere dal mondo greco a Roma* (Rome, 1997); *Le ambasciere romane ad gentes in età regia e repubblicana* (Rome, 2000); *Il ruolo dei 'patroni' nelle relazioni politiche fra il mondo greco e Roma in età repubblicana ed Augustea* (Munich, 2001); *Le relazioni diplomatiche di Roma. I. Dall'età regia alla conquista del primato in Italia (753–265 a. C.)* (Rome, 2004).

epigrafia e storia (Rome, 1990), pp. 295–300, this Roman commander is Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, L.f. L.n., consul in 192 B.C., who conquered the Boii in Cisalpine Gaul; according to E. Kunze, *V. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* (Berlin, 1956), pp. 160–4, he should be identified with Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, L.f. Cn.n., consul in 122 B.C., who won a victory over the Arverni in Transalpine Gaul. Neither can adduce any ancient evidence showing that Achaean auxiliaries were involved in those campaigns. De R. therefore suggests that the Gauls in question should be identified with the Galatian mercenaries of Antiochos III, and that Domitius is the consul of 192 B.C., who was only counsellor and legate of the consul L. Scipio at the battle of Magnesia ad Sipylum in 190 B.C., but who, according to Appian (*Syr.* 30.150), played a leading role on the battlefield. And we know that Achaean troops were present at the battle of Magnesia. This makes a convincing case.

Notwithstanding some of the criticism raised above about the choices made by de R., his book, like the first two volumes of this collection, will be indispensable, especially for scholars working on the relationship between Greece and Rome in the period under discussion.

University of Geneva

PIERRE SÁNCHEZ
pierre.sanchez@lettres.unige.ch

TOP GAULS II

BURNAND (Y.) *Primores Galliarum. Sénateurs et chevaliers romains originaires de Gaule de la fin de la République au III^e siècle. II: Prosopographie.* (Collection Latomus 302.) Pp. 630, ill., maps. Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2006. Paper, €85. ISBN: 978-2-87031-243-8.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X08001030

This is the second in a series of four volumes, the first of which ('Methodology') I reviewed in *CR* 57 (2007), 189–91. Volumes 3 ('Historical Analysis') and 4 ('Indices') have still to be published. Having identified the 291 individuals whom he is prepared to accept as senators and equestrians of Gallic birth, B. now offers as detailed a study as possible of each. He divides the fourteen chapters of his prosopography into four parts: I, Late Republic to Claudius (pp. 27–134); II, Nero to Domitian (pp. 135–344); III, Second century (pp. 345–509); IV, Third century (to Carus and Carausius) (pp. 511–614). He begins each chapter and each part with its own introduction, and ends with a summary distribution-table and discussion. He also ends each part with a summary distribution-map. He closes with an appendix on three undated *equites* (pp. 615–16) and a brief overall conclusion (pp. 617–18). He arranges his entries as far as possible in chronological order. Each consists of: reference-code; name; sources (textual, epigraphic, papyrological, as available, cited in Latin or Greek without translation); bibliography; and discussion. Each code consists of three elements: consecutive number; status ('E': equestrian; 'S': senatorial); consecutive number by status. Thus '37 S 7' denotes M. Julius Graecinus, the 37th known 'chief man' of Gaul, and the seventh known Gallic senator. *Anonymi*, totalling 36, are dealt with at the end of each chapter, and given